THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.PRAKASH RAO

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO.20100 of 1995

14th September 2006

Between:

1. K.Mohan Ramaiah, S/o.Late Satvanthaiah, 48 years, R/o.Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

And three others.

...PETITIONERS

AND

The Executive Officer, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanam, Tirupathi.

...RESPONDENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.PRAKASH RAO

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO.20100 of 1995

ORDER: (Per the Hon'ble Mr Justice Ramesh Ranganathan)

The petitioners, four in number, who were initially appointed as N.M.R. Helpers, whose services were regularized in the year 1975 and were promoted as Assistant Technicians Grade – II, seek exemption of the minimum five years service required for promotion as Assistant Technicians Grade – I.

Sri A.Bhaskara Chary, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that while the rules require a minimum five years service to be rendered in the category of Assistant Technician Grade – II for promotion to the post of Assistant Technician Grade – I, petitioner Nos.1, 3 and 4 had rendered services less than the minimum required five year period. While the shortfall of the period of the first, third and fourth petitioners is one year one month, insofar as the second petitioner is concerned, it is one year nine months.

Sri M.Adinarayana Raju, learned Standing Counsel for TTD, points out that pursuant to the interim order dated 28.09.1995, in

W.P.M.P.No.24656 of 1995, whereunder the respondent-TTD was required to consider the cases of the petitioners on par with other candidates, call letters were issued to the petitioners asking them to appear for the interviews to be held for selection to the post of Assistant Technician Grade – I. The petitioners herein did not, however, choose to participate in the selection process. Learned counsel would submit that while petitioner Nos.1 and 3 have been subsequently promoted as Assistant Technician Grade – I, the fourth petitioner has since died.

Since the petitioners herein, despite being called upon to participate in the selection process, chose not to participate, we see no reason at this point of time to grant them the benefit, which they have sought for in the Writ Petition.

The Writ Petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

(B.PRAKASH RAO, J)

(RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J)

14th September 2006
RRB

-